

Amendment to the Drawings:

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Figures 3 and 4. This sheet, which includes Figures 3 and 4, replaces the original sheet including Figures 3 and 4. In Figures 3 and 4, previously omitted axis labels have been added.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet
Annotated Sheet

REMARKS

By this amendment, claims 1-9 have been amended. Claims 1-9 remain in the application. Support for the amendments to the claim can be found the specification and drawings. No new matter has been added. This application has been carefully considered in connection with the Examiner's Action. Reconsideration, and allowance of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Objection to the Specification

The title stands objected to as being non descriptive. Applicant notes the objection and in response thereto has amended the title to be more clearly indicative of the subject matter to which the claims are directed. In particular, the title has been amended to read "Projection System Featuring Light Source Luminous Flux Sensing and Compensation." Accordingly, the objection is now believed overcome and should be withdrawn.

The disclosure stands objected to for various informalities. Applicant notes the objection to the disclosure and in response thereto has amended the disclosure on pages 2 and 3 of the specification to remove specific reference to individual claims. Accordingly, the objection is now believed overcome and should be withdrawn.

Objection to the Drawings

Drawing Figures 3 and 4 stand objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) as failing to show the vertical and horizontal axis labels as described in the specification. Applicant notes the objection to the drawings and in response thereto has amended the Figures 3 and 4 to contain vertical and horizontal axis labels. A replacement sheet of drawings and an annotated sheet of drawings is included with this response. Accordingly, the objection is now believed overcome and should be withdrawn.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claim 1 recites a projection system comprising:

a projection display;

at least one light source; and

a sensor means for sensing and compensating for changes in the luminous flux emitted by the at least one light source, wherein light emitted from the at least one light source comprises a first and a second spatial component which impinge on an entering face of an optical component of the projection system and a third spatial component which is directed into a region immediately surrounding the entering face, and wherein the sensor means comprises at least one sensor arrangement for sensing the third spatial component of the light from the light source that is directed into the region immediately surrounding the entering face of the optical component of the projection system.

Support for the amendments to claim 1 (and for the other claims) can be found in the specification at least on page 3, lines 18-22; page 6, lines 14-16, 26-29; page 7, lines 1-9, 15-23; and FIGs. 2, 5 and 6.

Claims 1, 3 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kavanagh (International Publication number WO 94/10675). With respect to claim 1, Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reason.

The PTO provides in MPEP § 2131 that

"[t]o anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim...."

Therefore, with respect to claim 1, to sustain this rejection the Kavanagh reference must contain all of the above claimed elements of the respective claims.

However, contrary to the examiner's position that all elements are disclosed in the Kavanagh reference, the latter reference does not disclose a "sensor means for sensing and compensating for changes in the luminous flux ... wherein light emitted from the at least one light source comprises a *first* and a *second* spatial component which *impinge* on an entering face of an optical component of the projection system and a *third spatial component* which is directed into a region immediately *surrounding the entering face* ... at least one sensor arrangement for sensing the *third spatial component* of the light from the light source that is *directed into* the region immediately *surrounding the entering face* of the optical component of the projection system" as is claimed in claim 1.

In contrast, Kavanagh discloses the use of a "*partially reflective mirror*, such as that indicated as 43 in Figure 1" being "*placed in the light path* from the source 1, so as to *divert* a small portion of the output of the source 1 into the detector 41" [Emphasis added] (see Kavanagh on page 10, lines 19-22). Accordingly, Kavanagh does not teach "... wherein light emitted from the at least one light source comprises a *first* and a *second* spatial component which *impinge* on an entering face of an optical component of the projection system and a *third spatial component* which is directed into a region immediately *surrounding the entering face* ... at least one sensor arrangement for sensing the *third spatial component* of the light from the light source that is *directed into* the region immediately *surrounding the entering face* of the optical component of the projection system" as is claimed in claim 1.

Therefore, the rejection is not supported by the Kavanagh reference and should be withdrawn. Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable and an early formal notice thereof is requested.

Dependent claims 3 and 9 depend from and further limit allowable independent claim 1 and therefore are allowable as well. Accordingly, the rejection has now been overcome and should be withdrawn.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kavanagh (International Publication number WO 94/10675) in view of Allen (Pub. No. 2003/0179192). This rejection is traversed for at least the following reason. Dependent claim 2 depends from and further limits allowable independent claim 1 and therefore is allowable as well. Accordingly, the rejection has now been overcome and should be withdrawn.

Claims 4 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kavanagh (International Publication number WO 94/10675) in view of Anderson (U.S. Patent 6,188,427). This rejection is traversed for at least the following reason. Dependent claims 4 and 5 depend from and further limit allowable independent claim 1 and therefore are allowable as well. Accordingly, the rejection has now been overcome and should be withdrawn.

Claims 6-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kavanagh (International Publication number WO 94/10675) in view of Morgan (Pub. No. 2003/0227465). This rejection is traversed for at least the following reason. Dependent claims 6-8 depend from and further limit allowable independent claim 1 and therefore are allowable as well. Accordingly, the rejection has now been overcome and should be withdrawn.


Conclusion

Except as indicated herein, the claims were not amended in order to address issues of patentability and Applicants respectfully reserve all rights they may have under the Doctrine of Equivalents. Applicants furthermore reserve their right to reintroduce subject matter deleted herein at a later time during the prosecution of this application or a continuation application.

It is clear from all of the foregoing that independent claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Dependent claims 2-9 depend from and further limit allowable independent claim 1 and therefore are allowable as well.

The amendments herein are fully supported by the original specification and drawings; therefore, no new matter is introduced. An early formal notice of allowance of claims 1-9 is requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Balconi-Lamica
Registration No. 34,291
for Frank Keegan, Reg. No. 50,145

Dated: Sept. 30, 2007

Philips Intellectual Property & Standards
345 Scarborough Road
Briarcliff Manor, New York 10510
Telephone: 914-333-9669
Facsimile: 914-332-0615
File: DE020178US

ATTACHMENTS

a-32658.168